Application Information

Due Date: Postmarked by April 27, 2001
By certified mail

Return an original and one (1) copy of this application and two (2) copies of the technology plan to:

> Michael Hall, Specialist
> Office of Public Instruction
> PO Box 202501
> Helena, MT 59620-2501

OPI USE ONLY

County _____ CO _____

District Name _____ LE _____

Page length _____ Postmark _____/_____/_____

Project Year
First Year: July 1, 2001—September 30, 2002
Continuation grants as appropriate: July 1, 2002—September 30, 2003

Original Authorized Representatives signatures are required on the Application.
Thus, NO electronic submissions will be accepted (e.g., NO facsimiles, e-mails, or disks).

This application includes basic financial and program information and will be completed ONLY by districts that receive and manage program funds (prime applicant districts).

PRIME APPLICANT: The Technology Literacy Challenge Fund Application (TLCF) requires a single prime applicant for the application. A "prime applicant" files the application, receives and manages program funds, and ensures funds are audited in accordance with federal requirements. The application for consortia members is filed only by the prime applicant district.

Prime Applicant Check one: ☐ Single District   ☐ Multiple Districts (consortia); please complete page 2

_____   _____
District Name   County

Amount requested for year 1 $_____	Amount requested for year 2 $_____
_____ % Hardware ✱	_____ % Hardware ✱
_____ % Connectivity	_____ % Connectivity
_____ % Content/Software	_____ % Content/Software
_____ % Maintenance and Technical Support	_____ % Maintenance and Technical Support
_____ %Professional Development: focus on infusing technology into curriculum and instruction ⊙ ▣	_____ %Professional Development: focus on infusing technology into curriculum and instruction ⊙ ▣
_____ % Professional Development focus on technology use and skills ⊙	_____ % Professional Development focus on technology use and skills ⊙
_____	_____
Total 100%	**Total 100%**
⊙ **Minimum of 33% required for Professional Development areas combined**	⊙ **Minimum of 33% required for Professional Development areas combined**
✱ **Maximum of 33% allowed**	✱ **Maximum of 33% allowed**
▣ **Minimum of 16.5% required for this area**	▣ **Minimum of 16.5% required for this area**

See page ii-iii of the Competitive Grant Application Supplement for assistance with budget percentages.

STATEMENT OF ASSURANCES:

Signature Information: The Board of Trustees submitted a Common Assurances form to the Office of Public Instruction for the 1996-97 school year, and no circumstances affecting the validity of the assurance have changed since its submittal. Further, the Board of Trustees approves of the district application for participating in the federal program as indicated in the instructions above. In addition the Board of Trustees agrees to the same common assurances and those contained in this application.

The applicant will consult, in a meaningful and timely manner, with nonpublic school officials regarding services from these grant funds to eligible children attending nonpublic elementary and secondary schools.

_____
Signature
Designated Authorized Representative

☐ Superintendent
☐ Principal (if there is no Superintendent)
☐ County Superintendent (if there is no Superintendent or Principal)

NOTE: When personnel changes occur in the positions listed above, the new person will become the Designated Authorized Representative.

2001-2002 TECHNOLOGY LITERACY CHALLENGE FUND APPLICATION

Peer Review: (Optional information)

List below the name(s) and contact information for your technology director and/or names of other qualified individuals who would be interested in participating in the grant review process in Helena is tentatively scheduled for **May 7-8, 2001**. Substitute fees and travel expenses will be covered by the grant program.

Name	Position	Address	ZIP Code	Phone
Name	Position	Address	ZIP Code	Phone

PARTICIPATING DISTRICTS: COMPLETE THIS PAGE WHEN MORE THAN ONE DISTRICT IS APPLYING (EXAMPLE: HELENA PUBLIC SCHOOLS WOULD USE THIS PAGE WHEN BOTH HELENA ELEMENTARY AND HELENA HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS ARE APPLYING TOGETHER).

The Board of Trustees of each of the districts listed below agreed to participate in the project.

District Name	Legal Entity	County Numbers	Original Signature of Authorized Representative
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			
16.			
17.			
18.			
19.			

2001-2002 TECHNOLOGY LITERACY CHALLENGE FUND APPLICATION

TECHNOLOGY PLAN REQUIREMENTS   **30 points possible**

All applicants must submit their local long-range technology plan (3 to 5 years) to OPI as part of the application process. Each plan must contain the following elements as required by federal and state regulation. Enter the appropriate page number(s) from the district technology plan for each of the items below.

A. The Plan must provide a description of the type of technologies to be acquired, including specific provisions for the technologies to work together and, to the extent practical, with existing technologies.
> SEE PAGE(S)_____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. MARK THAT SECTION(S) "A."

B. The Plan must provide an explanation of how acquired technologies will be integrated into the curriculum to enhance teaching, training and student achievement.
> SEE PAGE(S)_____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. MARK THAT SECTION(S) "B."

C. The Plan must provide an explanation of how programs will be developed in collaboration with existing adult literacy service providers to maximize the use of technologies.
> SEE PAGE(S)_____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. MARK THAT SECTION(S) "C."

D. The Plan must describe how the district will ensure ongoing, sustained professional development for teachers, administrators and school library media personnel to further the use of technology in the classroom or library media centers.
> SEE PAGE(S)_____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. MARK THAT SECTION(S) "D."

E. The Plan must identify the providers (individuals and businesses) of ongoing training and technical assistance available to schools, teachers and administrators served by the district (professional development providers, etc.) (This may also include the professional development activities of the federal programs such as the district's ESEA Titles I, II, IV and VI.)
> SEE PAGE(S)_____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. MARK THAT SECTION(S) "E."

F. The Plan must provide a description of the supporting resources, such as video, CD, software and print resources (program manuals, training modules, professional magazines, etc.), which will be acquired to ensure successful and effective use of technologies that are acquired.
> SEE PAGE(S)_____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. MARK THAT SECTION(S) "F."

G. The Plan must reflect the projected timetable for implementing the strategies long-range (3-5 years) plan in schools.
> SEE PAGE(S)_____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. MARK THAT SECTION(S) "G."

H. The Plan must address the projected total cost of technologies to be acquired and related expenses needed to implement the strategic long-range plan.
> SEE PAGE(S)_____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. MARK THAT SECTION(S) "H."

I. The Plan must describe how the district will coordinate available federal, state and local funding resources to implement the strategic long-range technology plan. (This may also include the activities of the federal programs such as the district's ESEA Titles I, II, IV and VI.)
> SEE PAGE(S)_____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. MARK THAT SECTION(S) "I."

J. The Plan must describe the community involvement in the development process of the strategic long-range technology plan.
> SEE PAGE(S)_____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. MARK THAT SECTION(S) "J."

K. The Plan must list and integrate local school improvement goals/activities.
> SEE PAGE(S)_____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. MARK THAT SECTION(S) "K."

L. The Plan must describe how the Plan will be evaluated and revised on a regular schedule.
> SEE PAGE(S)_____ OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. MARK THAT SECTION(S) "L."

2001-2002 TECHNOLOGY LITERACY CHALLENGE FUND APPLICATION
NARRATIVE RESPONSES

Narrative responses to items 1-4b are not to exceed seven pages total, 12 point or larger type, single-spaced. (See the print size sample on page iii of the Application Supplement.)

1. Project Abstract: (A brief description of the overall proposal)

2. School Improvement Linkages:
   Describe how the proposed grant objectives and activities link to and support current school improvement efforts at the local level.

10 points possible for all School Improvement Linkages

Objective Number	School Improvement Connection's/Support (list appropriate technology plan pages)

2001-2002 TECHNOLOGY LITERACY CHALLENGE FUND APPLICATION

3. Objectives	(Duplicate this page as needed for other objectives.)	20 points possible for all Objectives

Objective Number: _____

Objective:

Technology Plan Linkages: See page(s) _____ **of the attached technology plan and label that section(s) "Objectives."**

3a. Objective EVALUATION PLAN		15 points possible for Objective Evaluation Plan
Baseline Student Data **(Current Data Aligned to this Objective)**	**Desired Indicators of Student Impact (Specify for year one and year two) (Aligned to Baseline Student Data)**	**Actual Indicators of Student Impact**
		End-of-the-Grant-Year Data aligned to baseline data, are reported on the Year-End Evaluation
Baseline Teacher Professional Development Data **(Aligned to this objective)**	**Desired indicators of Professional Development Impact** **(Aligned to baseline Professional Development data)**	

3b. Proposed Activities to Accomplish the Objective:	20 points possible for proposed activities	Actual Activities
		Actual activities aligned to the successful completion of this objective are reported on the Year-End Evaluation.

2001-2002 TECHNOLOGY LITERACY CHALLENGE FUND APPLICATION
BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

4a. **Budget justification for year one: List each expenditure and briefly explain how it assists in accomplishing the proposal objectives.**

Note: It is required that at least one-third of the budget be allocated for staff development activities. **Total 15 points possible (4a + 4b)**

2001-2002 TECHNOLOGY LITERACY CHALLENGE FUND APPLICATION

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

4b. Budget justification for year two: List each expenditure and briefly explain how it assists in accomplishing the proposal objectives.
Note: It is required that at least one-third of the budget be allocated for staff development activities.   Total 15 points possible (4a + 4b)

Narrative responses to items 1-4b are not to exceed seven pages total.

The 2001-2002

Technology Literacy Challenge Fund Grants

Technology grants to help prepare students for the technological world of the 21st century.

Office of Public Instruction
Linda McCulloch, Superintendent
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501

Technology Literacy Challenge Fund
Public Law 103-382
ESEA Title III: Technology for Education

COMPETITIVE GRANT APPLICATION PROCESS

PURPOSE

ESEA Title III of Public Law 103-382, Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, provides funding to state education agencies with approved applications to award grants, on a competitive basis, to local education agencies to supplement local funds, in carrying out the following activities, as articulated in the local technology plan.

1. Develop, adapt or expand existing and new application of technology to support the **school reform** effort;
2. Conduct projects of sufficient size, scope and quality to improve student learning and, as appropriate, support professional development and provide administrative support;
3. Acquire connectivity linkages, resources and services, including the acquisition of hardware and software for use by teachers, students and school library media personnel in order to improve student learning by supporting the instructional program;
4. Provide ongoing professional development in the integration of quality educational technologies into school curriculum and long-term planning for implementing educational technologies;
5. Acquire connectivity with wide area networks for purposes of accessing information and educational programming sources, particularly with institutions of higher education and public libraries; and
6. Provide educational services for adults and families.

MONTANA PRIORITIES

Funds shall be used to enhance student learning through:

- Integrating technology into the curriculum and instruction at the district and school level and providing appropriate staff development; and/or
- Obtaining and maintaining connections to the information superhighway, and providing the appropriate staff development.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS AND FISCAL AGENTS

School districts or a consortia of districts may apply for funds. One school district, the prime applicant, must serve as the fiscal agent. The authorized representative for the prime district must sign the application.

Only one application will be accepted from a district, consortium, or districts in a consortium.

Districts currently receiving a Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (TLCF) grant are ineligible to apply.

DISTRICT NEED RATING

The Montana Office of Public Instruction ESEA Title III application, approved by the U.S. Department of Education, states that the OPI will award at least 50 percent of the funds to districts having the highest number or percentage of children in poverty and to districts that demonstrate the greatest need for technology. The OPI utilized low-income information (census/free and reduced-lunch data and Guaranteed Tax Base data) to establish low-income ratings for the districts. In addition, the information submitted by Montana schools on the Quality Education Data (QED) surveys was used to develop ratings for the need for technology. A maximum of 16 points may be earned utilizing a combination of these two factors.

Consortia Need Rating

Applications representing more than one district must complete the participating district's form on page 2 of the application. For example, if Helena Public Schools apply, they would complete the form and list the elementary and the high school districts on page 2.

If two or more districts apply as a consortium, the need rating for each district will be added together and divided by the number of districts in the consortium to obtain an average need rating.

District/Consortia Technology Plan

All applicants must submit their local long-range technology plans (projecting 3 to 5 years) to OPI as part of the application process. For consortia applications, one consortia-wide plan is required. If districts within the consortia have individual plans, a copy of those plans must be on file with the host district.

Estimated Size Range of Awards

The awards will range from a minimum of $8,000 to a maximum of $150,000 per year depending upon the amount that is reasonable for the size of the school district or consortia and the proposal objectives as they relate to the technology plan.

It is estimated that 15-18 grants will be awarded with an average size of $50,000 per year. The grants are offered as a one-year grant renewable for one more year, contingent upon federal funding statutes and regulations.

All projects will be reviewed at the end of the first year of operation to determine their suitability for receiving continued funding. Projects will be expected to submit a first year program evaluation and revised budget.

All grant awards are contingent upon the Montana Office of Public Instruction's receipt of funds from the federal government.

Budget Considerations

No more than five (5) percent of a grant may be used by a school district for administrative purposes.

No matching funds are required.

It is required that at least one-third (33%) of the budget be allocated for professional development activities to support the proposed objectives. Of the one-third for professional development, at least one-half (16.5 percent of total grant funds must be allocated to professional development with a focus on infusing technology into curriculum and instruction. Expenditures for hardware may not exceed 33 percent of total grant funds. (Current research suggests a one-third split for technology budgets: one-third for hardware, one-third for software and one-third for professional development.)

Proposed second-year budgets should be equal to or less than the proposed first-year budget.

Budget Percentages Listed on TLCF Grant Cover Page: (Percentages must total 100 percent.)

For each of the categories listed on the cover page of the application, record the following information for funds requested from this program:

_____% Hardware •List costs of all computers, building wiring and items necessary to make the network run, including the operating system software (e.g., Windows 2000). (Maximum 33 percent allowed.)

_____% Connectivity •List fees for the ongoing connection to the Internet and Instructional Television (ITV) systems.

_____% Content/ •List costs for acquiring software directly related to content instruction (include the cost of
      Software   distance learning courses provided to students, for example, ITV content fees).

_____% Professional Development: focus on technology use and skills
•List costs for providing the training necessary to implement the grant (trainer fees, travel, materials and supplies, stipends for time beyond the school year contract). Include the cost of distance learning professional development provided to the teaching staff, and include the salaries for staff members providing these services.

_____% Professional Development: focus on infusing technology into curriculum and instruction
•List costs for providing the training necessary to implement the grant (trainer fees, travel, materials and supplies, stipends for time beyond the school year contract). Include the cost of distance learning professional development provided to the teaching staff, and include the salaries for staff members providing these services.

_____% Maintenance and Technical Support
•List costs associated with providing maintenance and technical support by either district staff or via contracted services, including materials and supplies.

_____% **TOTAL 100%**

<u>Note:</u>
Separate budget pages are no longer required; instead, record the requested amounts in the space provided on the cover page and complete the budget justification section for both year 1 and year 2 of the grant proposal.

NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

Local education agencies or consortia that receive awards shall, after timely and meaningful consultation with appropriate nonpublic school officials, provide children enrolled in nonpublic schools, as well as their teachers and other education personnel, with an opportunity to participate on an equitable basis.

TIMELINES

March 16, 2001	Applications sent to requesting school districts.
April 27, 2001	<u>Applications postmarked to OPI by April 27, 2001.</u>
May 7-8, 2001	Application peer review in Helena (tentative date).
May 15, 2001	Award notification (tentative date).
July 1, 2001	Project start date.

LATE APPLICATIONS

Applications received that are postmarked after the April 27, 2001, deadline will not be included in the competition and will not be reviewed.

APPLICATION LENGTH

Applications received that exceed the seven-page total and/or 12 point or larger type, single spaced requirements for the narrative section responses to items 1-4b will not be included in the competition and will not be reviewed.

This is 12 point Courier.   This is 12 point Times.   This is 12 point Helvetica.

APPLICATION CONTENTS

All applications must include the completed forms provided for applicant information, consortium members (if appropriate) and technology plan requirements. The long-range technology plan (three to five years) must also be included. Do not include fancy bindings.

APPLICATION TRANSMITTAL

The original and one (1) copy of the completed grant application and two (2) copies of the appropriately referenced long-range technology plan **must be postmarked by April 27, 2001, and sent by certified mail to the Montana Office of Public Instruction**. Faxed applications will not be accepted.

PROJECT NARRATIVE

Before preparing the narrative sections of the application, an applicant should think carefully about the objectives of the grant, the design of the activities, the budget and evaluation portions of the grant proposal. The narrative should clearly and concisely articulate the proposed project.

*Note: The narrative sections 1-4b may be submitted on paper other than the supplied form. All information must be included. The page length and type size requirements apply.

SELECTION CRITERIA

Technology Plan Requirements   (30 points possible)

Each application will be reviewed to determine the degree to which the technology plan clearly and specifically incorporates the necessary elements as required by federal and state regulations.

School Improvement Linkages   (10 points possible)

Each application will be reviewed to determine the degree to which:

- The objectives and activities included in the grant proposal show a direct link to, and support for, school improvement efforts at the local level (i.e., local goals, local initiatives, etc., or state/national programs such as Schoolwide, Performance-Based Accreditation, Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges performance-based school accreditation option).
- The objectives and activities included in the grant proposal will assist in accomplishing the local goals.

Proposal Objectives   (20 points possible)

Please label objectives "Year One," "Year Two" or "Both" to clarify the proposal.
Each application will be reviewed to determine the degree to which:

- The proposal objectives show a clear linkage to the technology plan.
- The proposal objectives clearly articulate what is to be accomplished if this proposal is funded.
- The proposal objectives show a clear emphasis upon integrating technology into the district's curriculum and/or classroom instruction.
- Specific desired impacts on student learning are identified.

Evaluation Plan   (15 points possible)

Each application will be reviewed to determine the degree to which:

- Baseline data (student and teacher), aligned to the objectives, are included to show current status.
- Anticipated growth toward the objectives is included to show expected outcome.
- The application describes how the data collected will be utilized to refine the local technology plan and/or infusion of technology.

Planned Activities   (20 points possible)

Please label objectives "Year One," "Year Two" or "Both" to clarify the proposal.
Each application will be reviewed to determine the degree to which:

- The activities will accomplish the proposal objectives.
- The activities are within the scope of the proposal objectives.
- Staff development activities are included to support all objectives
- The desired impacts are achievable through the proposed activities.

Budget Justifications (Year 1 and Year 2)   (15 points possible)

Each application will be reviewed to determine the degree to which:

- Items budgeted for are linked to the activities/objectives in this proposal.
- Funding is included for each activity/objective in this proposal.
- Items within each budget category are well supported by a narrative.

Narrative Total   (110 points possible)

District/Consortia Need Rating   (16 points possible)

Each application will be reviewed to verify the need rating.

Application Total   (126 points possible)

CHECKLIST FOR APPLICATION COMPLETION

___ Cover page information completed (page 1).
___ Statement of Assurances signed (page 1).
___ Consortia list completed and signed (if more than one district is included in the application on page 2).
___ Technology plan attached and referenced as required (page 3).
___ Abstract completed (page 4).
___ Description of linkage to, and support for, school improvement efforts at the local level completed and technology plan referenced as appropriate (page 4).
___ Project Objectives completed and technology plan referenced as required (page 5).
___ Planned Activities completed (page 5).
___ Objective Evaluation plan completed (page 5).
___ Budget justifications completed (pages 6 and 7).
___ Completed application postmarked, certified mail, to OPI April 27, 2001. **No electronic submissions will be accepted (e.g., no facsimiles, e-mails, disks).**

CONTACT PERSON

Michael Hall
ESEA Title III Specialist
Montana Office of Public Instruction
PO Box 202501
Helena, Montana 59620-2501
Telephone: (406) 444-4422
Facsimile: (406) 444-1373
E-mail: mhall@state.mt.us

Dennie Munro
Program Assistant
Montana Office of Public Instruction
PO Box 202501
Helena, Montana 59620-2501
Telephone: (406) 444-3114
Facsimile: (406) 444-1373
E-mail: dmunro@state.mt.us

Technology Literacy Challenge Fund Grants
2001-2002

District/Consortia Need Rating

The Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) ESEA Title III application, approved by the U.S. Department of Education states that the OPI will award at least 50 percent of the funds to districts in the applicant pool that have the highest financial need and the greatest need for technology.

- ✓ Financial need was determined by utilizing Guaranteed Tax Base (GTB) data for each district. (0-6 points possible)

- ✓ Technology need was determined by examining three pieces of data from the Quality Education Data (QED) technology survey sent to all schools in the fall of 1998. (0-6 points possible)

  Data utilized:

  - ✓ The student to computer ratio. Only the newer, high-end computers were counted for the ratio.

  - ✓ The percent of computers placed in classrooms versus those in labs.

  - ✓ The percent of computers in instructional rooms that were connected to the Internet.

- ✓ Technology need was determined by examining the districts that have previously, or are currently receiving a Technology Literacy Challenge Fund grant and awarding need points to those who have not been awarded. (0 or 4 points possible)

A maximum of 16 points is possible through the combination of these factors.

2001-2002 TLCF NEED RATING

*No Data Available, technology survey not returned.

CO	LE	District Name	Financial Need	No Previous Award	Technology Need	Total Need
48	0861	ABSAROKEE ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
48	0862	ABSAROKEE H S	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
31	0577	ALBERTON SCHOOLS K-12	1.5	0.0	2.0	3.5
06	0085	ALBION ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
28	0536	ALDER ELEM	0.0	4.0	1.0	5.0
06	0096	ALZADA ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
16	0376	AMSTERDAM ELEM	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
12	0236	ANACONDA ELEM	4.0	4.0	1.5	9.5
12	0237	ANACONDA H S	4.0	4.0	4.0	12.0
16	0366	ANDERSON ELEM	4.0	4.0	*	8.0
24	0474	ARLEE ELEM	5.0	0.0	2.0	7.0
24	0475	ARLEE H S	4.0	0.0	2.0	6.0
34	1215	ARROWHEAD ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
44	0800	ASHLAND ELEM	3.0	0.0	2.0	5.0
25	0498	AUCHARD CREEK ELEM	5.0	4.0	*	9.0
25	0502	AUGUSTA ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
25	0503	AUGUSTA H S	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
39	0720	AVON ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
14	1218	AYERS ELEM	4.0	4.0	*	8.0
43	0785	BAINVILLE SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
13	0244	BAKER SCHOOLS K-12	1.5	4.0	2.3	7.8
22	0455	BASIN ELEM	0.0	4.0	5.0	9.0
03	0048	BEAR PAW ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
01	0006	BEAVERHEAD COUNTY H S	2.0	4.0	3.0	9.0
05	0076	BELFRY SCHOOLS K-12	2.0	4.0	3.0	9.0
16	0368	BELGRADE ELEM	4.0	0.0	*	4.0
16	0369	BELGRADE H S	3.0	0.0	3.0	6.0
38	0695	BELLE CREEK ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
07	0112	BELT ELEM	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
07	0113	BELT H S	2.0	4.0	3.0	9.0
08	0171	BENTON LAKE ELEM	0.0	4.0	1.0	5.0
17	0388	BENZIEN ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
38	0692	BIDDLE ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
17	0380	BIG DRY CREEK ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
08	0137	BIG SANDY ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
08	0138	BIG SANDY H S	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
49	0865	BIG TIMBER ELEM	2.0	4.0	*	6.0
15	0330	BIGFORK ELEM	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
15	0331	BIGFORK H S	0.0	4.0	5.0	9.0
56	0965	BILLINGS ELEM	2.0	4.0	3.9	9.9
56	0966	BILLINGS H S	2.0	4.0	3.3	9.3
44	0789	BIRNEY ELEM	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
11	0215	BLOOMFIELD ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
56	0968	BLUE CREEK ELEM	3.0	0.0	3.0	6.0
21	1220	BLUE SKY SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
32	0590	BONNER ELEM	3.0	0.0	3.0	6.0
22	0456	BOULDER ELEM	3.0	4.0	3.0	10.0
21	0425	BOX ELDER ELEM	5.0	0.0	4.5	9.5
21	0426	BOX ELDER H S	4.0	0.0	3.0	7.0
05	0070	BOYD ELEM	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
16	0350	BOZEMAN ELEM	1.0	4.0	3.5	8.5
16	0351	BOZEMAN H S	1.0	4.0	3.5	8.5
37	0682	BRADY SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
49	0881	BRIDGE ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0

CO	LE	District Name	Financial Need	No Previous Award	Technology Need	Total Need
05	0059	BRIDGER SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	5.0	9.0
38	0705	BROADUS ELEM	2.0	4.0	3.0	9.0
56	0978	BROADVIEW ELEM	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
56	0979	BROADVIEW H S	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
43	0782	BROCKTON ELEM	5.0	0.0	3.0	8.0
43	0783	BROCKTON H S	5.0	0.0	3.0	8.0
42	0749	BRORSON ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
18	0400	BROWNING ELEM	5.0	4.0	3.0	12.0
18	0401	BROWNING H S	4.0	4.0	2.0	10.0
47	0840	BUTTE ELEM	3.0	0.0	4.4	7.4
47	1212	BUTTE H S	2.0	0.0	*	2.0
50	0889	BYNUM ELEM	4.0	4.0	4.0	12.0
45	0813	CAMAS PRAIRIE ELEM	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
56	0969	CANYON CREEK ELEM	3.0	4.0	4.0	11.0
22	0458	CARDWELL ELEM	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0
06	0097	CARTER COUNTY H S	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0
08	0159	CARTER ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
07	0101	CASCADE ELEM	1.0	4.0	4.0	9.0
07	0102	CASCADE H S	2.0	4.0	2.0	8.0
15	0317	CAYUSE PRAIRIE ELEM	3.0	4.0	5.0	12.0
07	0104	CENTERVILLE ELEM	4.0	0.0	1.0	5.0
07	0105	CENTERVILLE H S	4.0	0.0	3.0	7.0
24	1205	CHARLO ELEM	4.0	0.0	*	4.0
24	1206	CHARLO H S	4.0	0.0	*	4.0
26	0510	CHESTER ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
26	0511	CHESTER H S	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
03	0028	CHINOOK ELEM	3.0	4.0	4.0	11.0
03	0029	CHINOOK H S	1.0	4.0	4.0	9.0
50	0883	CHOTEAU ELEM	2.0	4.0	*	6.0
50	0884	CHOTEAU H S	1.0	4.0	2.0	7.0
29	0547	CIRCLE ELEM	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
29	0548	CIRCLE H S	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
22	0452	CLANCY ELEM	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
03	0032	CLEVELAND ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
32	0595	CLINTON ELEM	3.0	0.0	4.0	7.0
06	0086	COAL CREEK-PLAINVIEW ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
17	0387	COHAGEN ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
44	0796	COLSTRIP ELEM	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0
44	0797	COLSTRIP H S	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0
15	0312	COLUMBIA FALLS ELEM	2.0	4.0	2.0	8.0
15	0313	COLUMBIA FALLS H S	2.0	4.0	3.0	9.0
48	0848	COLUMBUS ELEM	1.0	0.0	3.0	4.0
48	0849	COLUMBUS H S	1.0	0.0	3.0	4.0
02	0022	COMMUNITY ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
37	0674	CONRAD ELEM	2.0	4.0	4.0	10.0
37	0675	CONRAD H S	2.0	4.0	4.0	10.0
34	0617	COOKE CITY ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
41	0731	CORVALLIS SCHOOLS K-12	4.0	0.0	4.3	8.3
09	0182	COTTONWOOD ELEM	0.0	4.0	1.0	5.0
16	0359	COTTONWOOD ELEM	2.0	4.0	*	6.0
21	0445	COTTONWOOD ELEM	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
25	0497	CRAIG ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
15	0316	CRESTON ELEM	1.0	4.0	*	5.0
43	0777	CULBERTSON ELEM	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
43	0778	CULBERTSON H S	1.0	4.0	3.0	8.0
09	0192	CUSTER COUNTY H S	3.0	4.0	*	7.0
56	0975	CUSTER SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0

CO	LE	District Name	Financial Need	No Previous Award	Technology Need	Total Need
18	0402	CUT BANK ELEM	1.0	4.0	2.5	7.5
18	0403	CUT BANK H S	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
41	0740	DARBY SCHOOLS K-12	2.5	4.0	*	6.5
21	0424	DAVEY ELEM	1.0	4.0	*	5.0
11	0207	DAWSON COUNTY H S	3.0	4.0	2.0	9.0
07	1195	DEEP CREEK ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
11	1193	DEER CREEK ELEM	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0
39	0712	DEER LODGE ELEM	3.0	0.0	4.0	7.0
15	0307	DEER PARK ELEM	4.0	4.0	*	8.0
14	0264	DEERFIELD ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
14	0281	DENTON ELEM	0.0	4.0	1.0	5.0
14	0282	DENTON H S	0.0	4.0	1.0	5.0
32	0592	DESMET ELEM	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
01	0005	DILLON ELEM	3.0	4.0	4.3	11.3
47	0843	DIVIDE ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
45	0809	DIXON ELEM	4.0	0.0	2.0	6.0
36	0647	DODSON ELEM	1.0	4.0	*	5.0
36	0648	DODSON H S	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
20	0419	DRUMMOND ELEM	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
20	0420	DRUMMOND H S	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
37	0671	DUPUYER ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
50	0893	DUTTON SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
18	0404	EAST GLACIER PARK ELEM	1.0	4.0	*	5.0
25	0492	EAST HELENA ELEM	3.0	0.0	3.5	6.5
05	0073	EDGAR ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
06	0087	EKALAKA ELEM	2.0	0.0	4.0	6.0
56	0972	ELDER GROVE ELEM	4.0	4.0	6.0	14.0
39	0719	ELLISTON ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
56	0981	ELYSIAN ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
28	0546	ENNIS SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
27	0527	EUREKA ELEM	3.0	4.0	3.5	10.5
15	0339	EVERGREEN ELEM	3.0	0.0	6.0	9.0
50	0890	FAIRFIELD ELEM	3.0	0.0	2.0	5.0
50	0891	FAIRFIELD H S	3.0	0.0	2.0	5.0
15	0308	FAIR-MONT-EGAN ELEM	4.0	4.0	3.0	11.0
42	0750	FAIRVIEW ELEM	1.0	4.0	2.0	7.0
42	0751	FAIRVIEW H S	3.0	4.0	2.0	9.0
14	0259	FERGUS H S	3.0	0.0	2.0	5.0
48	0853	FISHTAIL ELEM	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
15	0311	FLATHEAD H S	2.0	4.0	5.0	11.0
10	0200	FLAXVILLE SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
41	0743	FLORENCE-CARLTON SCHOOLS K-12	4.0	0.0	3.0	7.0
44	0790	FORSYTH ELEM	1.0	0.0	2.0	3.0
44	0791	FORSYTH H S	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
08	0133	FORT BENTON ELEM	1.0	4.0	*	5.0
08	0134	FORT BENTON H S	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
27	0529	FORTINE ELEM	2.0	4.0	2.0	8.0
53	0927	FRAZER ELEM	2.0	4.0	1.0	7.0
53	0928	FRAZER H S	0.0	4.0	1.0	5.0
32	0599	FRENCHTOWN SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	4.5	8.5
43	0786	FROID ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
43	0787	FROID H S	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
05	0071	FROMBERG ELEM	4.0	0.0	4.0	8.0
05	0072	FROMBERG H S	1.0	0.0	3.0	4.0
43	0774	FRONTIER ELEM	0.0	4.0	6.0	10.0
51	0915	GALATA ELEM	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
16	0364	GALLATIN GATEWAY ELEM	1.0	4.0	*	5.0

CO	LE	District Name	Financial Need	No Previous Award	Technology Need	Total Need
34	0614	GARDINER ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.5	6.5
34	1191	GARDINER HS	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
17	0378	GARFIELD COUNTY H S	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
39	0718	GARRISON ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
08	0153	GERALDINE ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
08	0154	GERALDINE H S	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
23	0472	GEYSER ELEM	0.0	4.0	5.0	9.0
23	0473	GEYSER H S	0.0	4.0	5.0	9.0
21	1217	GILDFORD COLONY ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
53	0926	GLASGOW SCHOOLS K-12	1.5	0.0	4.0	5.5
11	0206	GLENDIVE ELEM	4.0	4.0	2.3	10.3
39	0721	GOLD CREEK ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
50	0896	GOLDEN RIDGE ELEM	3.0	4.0	*	7.0
01	0003	GRANT ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
14	0268	GRASS RANGE ELEM	2.0	4.0	*	6.0
14	0269	GRASS RANGE H S	2.0	4.0	3.0	9.0
07	0098	GREAT FALLS ELEM	3.0	4.0	2.3	9.3
07	0099	GREAT FALLS H S	3.0	4.0	2.0	9.0
50	0900	GREENFIELD ELEM	3.0	4.0	4.0	11.0
49	0872	GREYCLIFF ELEM	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
20	0418	HALL ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
41	0735	HAMILTON SCHOOLS K-12	2.5	0.0	4.5	7.0
06	0078	HAMMOND-HAWKS HOME ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
02	0023	HARDIN ELEM	4.0	4.0	4.0	12.0
02	1189	HARDIN H S	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
03	0030	HARLEM ELEM	5.0	4.0	6.0	15.0
03	0031	HARLEM H S	3.0	4.0	3.0	10.0
54	0945	HARLOWTON ELEM	2.0	4.0	2.0	8.0
54	0946	HARLOWTON H S	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
28	0543	HARRISON SCHOOLS K-12	1.5	4.0	3.0	8.5
21	0427	HAVRE ELEM	3.0	4.0	5.2	12.2
21	0428	HAVRE H S	3.0	4.0	2.0	9.0
03	1213	HAYS-LODGE POLE SCHOOLS K-12	6.0	0.0	*	6.0
37	0670	HEART BUTTE ELEM	6.0	4.0	3.0	13.0
37	1226	HEART BUTTE H S	6.0	4.0	3.0	13.0
25	0487	HELENA ELEM	3.0	0.0	4.1	7.1
15	0320	HELENA FLATS ELEM	4.0	4.0	2.0	10.0
25	0488	HELENA H S	3.0	0.0	*	3.0
32	0586	HELLGATE ELEM	2.0	4.0	1.0	7.0
39	0717	HELMVILLE ELEM	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
08	0145	HIGHWOOD ELEM	1.0	4.0	*	5.0
08	0146	HIGHWOOD H S	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
53	0932	HINSDALE ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
53	0933	HINSDALE H S	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
23	0469	HOBSON SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
09	0179	HOCKETT-BASIN SPR CRK EL	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0
45	0814	HOT SPRINGS ELEM	4.0	4.0	*	8.0
45	0815	HOT SPRINGS H S	3.0	4.0	2.0	9.0
56	0983	HUNTLEY PROJECT SCHOOLS K-12	2.0	4.0	*	6.0
52	0923	HYSHAM SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
56	0989	INDEPENDENT ELEM	3.0	4.0	6.0	13.0
01	0014	JACKSON ELEM	0.0	4.0	1.0	5.0
05	0063	JACKSON ELEM	1.0	4.0	*	5.0
22	0457	JEFFERSON H S	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0
26	0508	J-I SCHOOLS (K-12)	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
06	0083	JOHNSTON ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
05	0060	JOLIET ELEM	3.0	4.0	4.0	11.0

CO	LE	District Name	Financial Need	No Previous Award	Technology Need	Total Need
05	0061	JOLIET H S	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
17	0377	JORDAN ELEM	2.0	4.0	*	6.0
54	0948	JUDITH GAP ELEM	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
54	0949	JUDITH GAP H S	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
15	0310	KALISPELL ELEM	2.0	4.0	3.8	9.8
25	0489	KESSLER ELEM	2.0	4.0	5.0	11.0
17	0386	KESTER ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
21	1208	K-G ELEM	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
21	1209	K-G H S	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
15	0323	KILA ELEM	2.0	4.0	5.0	11.0
14	0272	KING COLONY ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
09	0187	KINSEY ELEM	1.0	4.0	4.0	9.0
09	0173	KIRCHER ELEM	0.0	4.0	1.0	5.0
08	0161	KNEES ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
16	0367	LA MOTTE ELEM	0.0	4.0	5.0	9.0
42	0768	LAMBERT ELEM	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
42	0769	LAMBERT H S	1.0	4.0	4.0	9.0
44	0792	LAME DEER ELEM	6.0	4.0	6.0	16.0
44	1230	LAME DEER H S	6.0	4.0	4.0	14.0
36	0653	LANDUSKY ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
56	0970	LAUREL ELEM	2.0	4.0	*	6.0
56	0971	LAUREL H S	2.0	4.0	2.0	8.0
19	0411	LAVINA SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	5.0	9.0
30	0568	LENNEP ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
14	0258	LEWISTOWN ELEM	4.0	0.0	6.0	10.0
27	0522	LIBBY SCHOOLS K-12	3.5	0.0	3.8	7.3
26	1224	LIBERTY ELEM	6.0	4.0	*	10.0
01	0009	LIMA SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
27	0528	LINCOLN COUNTY H S	3.0	4.0	4.0	11.0
25	1221	LINCOLN SCHOOLS K-12	2.5	4.0	1.0	7.5
11	0216	LINDSAY ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
34	0612	LIVINGSTON ELEM	3.0	4.0	*	7.0
03	0036	LLOYD ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
56	0967	LOCKWOOD ELEM	3.0	0.0	*	3.0
02	0025	LODGE GRASS ELEM	5.0	4.0	*	9.0
02	1190	LODGE GRASS H S	4.0	4.0	*	8.0
32	0588	LOLO ELEM	4.0	0.0	3.0	7.0
08	0135	LOMA ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
41	0741	LONE ROCK ELEM	3.0	0.0	2.0	5.0
53	0941	LUSTRE ELEM	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
05	0064	LUTHER ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
16	0370	MALMBORG ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
36	0658	MALTA ELEM	1.0	4.0	2.5	7.5
36	0659	MALTA H S	2.0	4.0	3.0	9.0
16	0347	MANHATTAN ELEM	4.0	4.0	6.0	14.0
16	0348	MANHATTAN H S	3.0	4.0	3.0	10.0
15	0341	MARION ELEM	0.0	4.0	5.0	9.0
27	0530	MCCORMICK ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
49	0875	MCLEOD ELEM	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
46	0821	MEDICINE LAKE ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
46	0822	MEDICINE LAKE H S	1.0	4.0	2.0	7.0
47	0844	MELROSE ELEM	2.0	4.0	1.0	7.0
33	0607	MELSTONE ELEM	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
33	0608	MELSTONE H S	4.0	0.0	1.0	5.0
49	0868	MELVILLE ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
37	0684	MIAMI ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
09	0172	MILES CITY ELEM	4.0	4.0	*	8.0

CO	LE	District Name	Financial Need	No Previous Award	Technology Need	Total Need
32	0583	MISSOULA ELEM	2.0	0.0	*	2.0
32	0584	MISSOULA H S	2.0	0.0	3.3	5.3
48	0852	MOLT ELEM	0.0	4.0	1.0	5.0
16	0363	MONFORTON ELEM	3.0	0.0	*	3.0
22	0460	MONTANA CITY ELEM	3.0	4.0	3.0	10.0
09	0184	MOON CREEK ELEM	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0
14	0273	MOORE ELEM	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
14	0274	MOORE H S	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
56	0976	MORIN ELEM	0.0	4.0	1.0	5.0
18	1222	MOUNTAIN VIEW ELEM	4.0	4.0	*	8.0
33	0600	MUSSELSHELL ELEM	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
53	0937	NASHUA SCHOOLS K-12	1.0	4.0	2.0	7.0
03	1216	NORTH HARLEM COLONY ELEM	3.0	4.0	*	7.0
45	0811	NOXON ELEM	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
45	0812	NOXON H S	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
48	0857	NYE ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
15	0342	OLNEY-BISSELL ELEM	1.0	4.0	4.0	9.0
53	0935	OPHEIM SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
16	0375	OPHIR ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
46	0831	OUTLOOK SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0
39	0715	OVANDO ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
45	0808	PARADISE ELEM	1.0	4.0	4.0	9.0
48	0846	PARK CITY ELEM	2.0	4.0	3.0	9.0
48	0847	PARK CITY H S	3.0	4.0	3.0	10.0
34	0613	PARK H S	2.0	4.0	5.0	11.0
16	0362	PASS CREEK ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
10	0196	PEERLESS SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	1.0	5.0
50	0898	PENDROY ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
20	0416	PHILIPSBURG SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	0.0	4.5	4.5
34	0620	PINE CREEK ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
17	0385	PINE GROVE ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
56	0987	PIONEER ELEM	1.0	4.0	1.0	6.0
45	0802	PLAINS ELEM	3.0	4.0	5.0	12.0
45	0803	PLAINS H S	2.0	4.0	5.0	11.0
15	0325	PLEASANT VALLEY ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
02	1214	PLENTY COUPS H S	5.0	4.0	3.0	12.0
46	0828	PLENTYWOOD SCHOOLS K-12	2.0	4.0	2.0	8.0
13	0256	PLEVNA SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
01	0012	POLARIS ELEM	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0
24	0477	POLSON ELEM	1.0	4.0	4.0	9.0
24	0478	POLSON H S	0.0	4.0	5.0	9.0
43	0775	POPLAR ELEM	3.0	4.0	2.5	9.5
43	0776	POPLAR H S	2.0	4.0	1.0	7.0
32	0589	POTOMAC ELEM	4.0	0.0	*	4.0
38	0706	POWDER RIVER CO DIST H S	2.0	4.0	*	6.0
39	0713	POWELL COUNTY H S	1.0	4.0	4.0	9.0
50	0894	POWER ELEM	1.0	4.0	*	5.0
50	0895	POWER H S	3.0	4.0	*	7.0
02	0021	PRYOR ELEM	2.0	4.0	3.0	9.0
47	0842	RAMSAY ELEM	0.0	4.0	6.0	10.0
48	0858	RAPELJE ELEM	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0
48	0859	RAPELJE H S	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0
42	0754	RAU ELEM	1.0	4.0	4.0	9.0
23	0471	RAYNESFORD ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
05	0056	RED LODGE ELEM	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
05	0057	RED LODGE H S	1.0	4.0	2.0	7.0
48	0850	REEDPOINT ELEM	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CO	LE	District Name	Financial Need	No Previous Award	Technology Need	Total Need
48	0851	REEDPOINT H S	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
01	0015	REICHLE ELEM	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0
11	0227	RICHEY ELEM	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
11	0228	RICHEY H S	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
06	0090	RIDGE ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
30	0574	RINGLING ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
05	0069	ROBERTS SCHOOLS K-12	3.5	4.0	5.0	12.5
44	0788	ROCK SPRING ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
21	1207	ROCKY BOY ELEM	6.0	0.0	2.5	8.5
21	1229	ROCKY BOY H S	6.0	0.0	2.5	8.5
24	1199	RONAN ELEM	5.0	0.0	4.3	9.3
24	1200	RONAN H S	4.0	0.0	*	4.0
44	0794	ROSEBUD ELEM	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
44	0795	ROSEBUD H S	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
17	0394	ROSS ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
33	0605	ROUNDUP ELEM	3.0	0.0	2.0	5.0
33	0606	ROUNDUP H S	3.0	0.0	4.0	7.0
14	0280	ROY SCHOOLS K-12	0.5	4.0	4.0	8.5
19	0407	RYEGATE SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	1.0	5.0
09	0190	S H-FOSTER CREEK ELEM	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0
09	0189	S Y ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
36	1203	SACO ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
36	0657	SACO H S	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
17	0392	SAND SPRINGS ELEM	0.0	4.0	1.0	5.0
42	0747	SAVAGE ELEM	3.0	4.0	2.0	9.0
42	0748	SAVAGE H S	3.0	4.0	2.0	9.0
10	0194	SCOBEY SCHOOLS K-12	2.5	0.0	3.0	5.5
32	0597	SEELEY LAKE ELEM	2.0	0.0	3.0	5.0
54	0947	SHAWMUT ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
51	0910	SHELBY ELEM	2.0	4.0	*	6.0
51	0911	SHELBY H S	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
56	0985	SHEPHERD ELEM	4.0	4.0	3.0	11.0
56	0986	SHEPHERD H S	4.0	4.0	3.0	11.0
28	0537	SHERIDAN ELEM	3.0	4.0	*	7.0
28	0538	SHERIDAN H S	2.0	4.0	*	6.0
34	1227	SHIELDS VALLEY ELEM	1.0	4.0	3.5	8.5
34	1228	SHIELDS VALLEY H S	2.0	4.0	*	6.0
42	0745	SIDNEY ELEM	3.0	4.0	4.0	11.0
42	0746	SIDNEY H S	3.0	4.0	3.0	10.0
07	0118	SIMMS H S	3.0	4.0	*	7.0
15	0324	SMITH VALLEY ELEM	4.0	4.0	4.0	12.0
15	0327	SOMERS ELEM	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0
38	0709	SOUTH STACEY ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
29	0562	SOUTHVIEW ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
14	0288	SPRING CREEK COLONY ELEM	3.0	4.0	3.0	10.0
34	0635	SPRINGDALE ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
16	0357	SPRINGHILL ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
02	0020	SQUIRREL CREEK ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
24	0481	ST IGNATIUS SCHOOLS K-12	5.0	4.0	2.0	11.0
31	0582	ST REGIS SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
23	0464	STANFORD SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	0.0	*	0.0
41	0732	STEVENSVILLE ELEM	4.0	4.0	2.0	10.0
41	0733	STEVENSVILLE H S	4.0	4.0	2.0	10.0
07	1225	SUN RIVER VALLEY ELEM	4.0	0.0	5.0	9.0
51	0903	SUNBURST SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
32	0594	SUNSET ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
31	0579	SUPERIOR SCHOOLS K-12	3.5	0.0	2.0	5.5

CO	LE	District Name	Financial Need	No Previous Award	Technology Need	Total Need
24	0486	SWAN LAKE-SALMON ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
15	0309	SWAN RIVER ELEM	1.0	4.0	4.0	9.0
32	0596	SWAN VALLEY ELEM	1.0	4.0	4.0	9.0
49	0882	SWEET GRASS COUNTY H S	0.0	0.0	6.0	6.0
27	0532	SYLVANITE ELEM	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
32	0593	TARGET RANGE ELEM	2.0	0.0	3.0	5.0
40	0726	TERRY SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
45	0804	THOMPSON FALLS ELEM	0.0	4.0	5.0	9.0
45	0805	THOMPSON FALLS H S	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
16	0360	THREE FORKS ELEM	1.0	4.0	6.0	11.0
16	0361	THREE FORKS H S	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
04	0055	TOWNSEND SCHOOLS K-12	0.5	4.0	3.0	7.5
09	0177	TRAIL CREEK ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
27	0534	TREGO ELEM	2.0	4.0	2.0	8.0
25	0491	TRINITY ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
45	0807	TROUT CREEK ELEM	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
27	0519	TROY ELEM	3.0	0.0	4.0	7.0
27	0520	TROY H S	3.0	0.0	4.0	7.0
03	0044	TURNER ELEM	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
03	0045	TURNER H S	2.0	4.0	*	6.0
28	0540	TWIN BRIDGES SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	4.5	8.5
09	0188	TWIN BUTTES ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
54	0944	TWO DOT ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
07	0131	ULM ELEM	4.0	4.0	5.5	13.5
24	1211	UPPER WEST SHORE ELEM	0.0	4.0	1.0	5.0
37	0679	VALIER ELEM	1.0	4.0	4.0	9.0
37	0680	VALIER H S	1.0	4.0	3.0	8.0
24	0483	VALLEY VIEW ELEM	3.0	0.0	4.0	7.0
17	0382	VAN NORMAN ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
07	0127	VAUGHN ELEM	3.0	4.0	4.0	11.0
41	0738	VICTOR SCHOOLS K-12	1.5	4.0	2.0	7.5
29	0566	VIDA ELEM	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
08	0144	WARRICK ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
15	1223	WEST GLACIER ELEM	0.0	4.0	6.0	10.0
15	1184	WEST VALLEY ELEM	3.0	4.0	5.0	12.0
16	0374	WEST YELLOWSTONE SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	4.0	8.0
46	0818	WESTBY ELEM	0.0	4.0	1.5	5.5
46	0819	WESTBY H S	1.0	4.0	2.0	7.0
30	0569	WHITE SULPHUR SPGS ELEM	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
30	0570	WHITE SULPHUR SPGS H S	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0
15	0334	WHITEFISH ELEM	1.0	4.0	2.0	7.0
15	0335	WHITEFISH H S	1.0	4.0	*	5.0
22	0453	WHITEHALL ELEM	3.0	4.0	3.0	10.0
22	0454	WHITEHALL H S	1.0	4.0	2.0	7.0
36	0663	WHITEWATER SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
26	0506	WHITLASH ELEM	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0
55	0964	WIBAUX SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	0.0	3.5	3.5
16	0354	WILLOW CREEK ELEM	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
16	0355	WILLOW CREEK H S	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
14	0291	WINIFRED SCHOOLS K-12	2.5	0.0	5.0	7.5
35	0642	WINNETT SCHOOLS K-12	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0
01	0010	WISDOM ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0
01	0007	WISE RIVER ELEM	0.0	4.0	3.0	7.0
25	0495	WOLF CREEK ELEM	0.0	4.0	6.0	10.0
43	0780	WOLF POINT ELEM	5.0	4.0	*	9.0
43	0781	WOLF POINT H S	3.0	4.0	2.0	9.0
32	0591	WOODMAN ELEM	2.0	4.0	*	6.0

CO	LE	District Name	Financial Need	No Previous Award	Technology Need	Total Need
02	0026	WYOLA ELEM	0.0	4.0	6.0	10.0
27	0533	YAAK ELEM	0.0	4.0	2.0	6.0
56	1196	YELLOWSTONE ACADEMY	6.0	4.0	3.0	13.0
03	0034	ZURICH ELEM	0.0	4.0	*	4.0

Grant Evaluation Rubric
2001-2002 Technology Literacy
Challenge Fund Grants

1. TECHNOLOGY PLAN—30 POINTS POSSIBLE (12 items at 5 points each = 60, weighted at .5 ='s 30 points possible.)

OPI USE ONLY:

Application Total_____

REVIEWER USE:

LE: ___ ___ ___ ___
Dist. Name:_____
Reviewer:_____

Information provided clearly and specifically details the required elements.

	Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree
A. The Plan must provide a description of the type of technologies to be acquired, including specific provisions for the technologies to work together and, to the extent practical, with existing technologies.	1	2	3	4	5
B. The Plan must provide an explanation of how acquired technologies will be integrated into the curriculum to enhance teaching, training and student achievement.	1	2	3	4	5
C. The Plan must provide an explanation of how programs will be developed in collaboration with existing adult literacy service providers to maximize the use of technologies.	1	2	3	4	5
D. The Plan must describe how the district will ensure ongoing, sustained professional development for teachers, administrators and school library media personnel to further the use of technology in the classroom or library media centers.	1	2	3	4	5
E. The Plan must identify the providers (individuals and businesses) of ongoing training and technical assistance available to schools, teachers and administrators served by the district. (This may also include the activities of the federal programs such as the district's ESEA Titles I, II, IV and VI.)	1	2	3	4	5
F. The Plan must provide a description of the supporting resources, such as services, software and print resources, which will be acquired to ensure successful and effective use of technologies that are acquired.	1	2	3	4	5
G. The Plan must reflect the projected timetable for implementing the strategic long-range (3-5 years) plan in schools.	1	2	3	4	5
H. The Plan must address the projected total cost of technologies to be acquired and related expenses needed to implement the strategic long-range plan.	1	2	3	4	5
I. The Plan must describe how the district will coordinate available federal, state and local funding resources to implement the strategic long-range technology plan. (This may also include the activities of the federal programs such as the district's ESEA Titles I, II, IV and VI.)	1	2	3	4	5
J. The Plan must describe the community involvement in the development process of the strategic long-range technology plan.	1	2	3	4	5
K. The Plan must list and integrate local school improvement goals/activities.	1	2	3	4	5
L. The Plan must describe how the Plan will be evaluated and revised on a regular schedule.	1	2	3	4	5

Assessment Rubric Scoring
5   Information provided **clearly and specifically details** the required elements and leaves no questions to be answered.
4   Information provided **details** the required elements.
3   Information provided does **not fully detail** the required elements and leaves questions to be answered.
2   Information is **incomplete or vague** and leaves major questions to be answered.
1   Information is **missing**.

2. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT LINKAGES—10 POINTS (2 items x 5 points each = 10 points possible)

		DISAGREE		AGREE		STRONGLY AGREE
a.	The objectives and activities included in the grant proposal show a direct link to, and support for, school improvement efforts at the local level (i.e., local goals, local initiatives, etc., or state/national programs such as Schoolwide, Performance-Based Accreditation, Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges performance-based school accreditation option).	1	2	3	4	5
b.	The objectives and activities included in the grant proposal will assist in accomplishing the local goals.	1	2	3	4	5

3. PROPOSAL OBJECTIVES—20 POINTS (4 items x 5 points each = 20 possible points)

		DISAGREE		AGREE		STRONGLY AGREE
a.	The proposal objectives show a clear linkage to the technology plan.	1	2	3	4	5
b.	The proposal objectives clearly articulate what is to be accomplished if this proposal is funded.	1	2	3	4	5
c.	The proposal objectives show a clear emphasis upon integrating technology into the district's curriculum and/or classroom instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
d.	Specific desired impacts on student learning are identified.	1	2	3	4	5

3a. EVALUATION PLAN—15 POINTS (3 items x 5 points each = 15 points possible)

		DISAGREE		AGREE		STRONGLY AGREE
a.	Baseline data (student and teacher), aligned to the objectives, are included to show current status.	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Anticipated growth toward the objectives is included to show expected outcome.	1	2	3	4	5
c.	The application describes how the data collected will be utilized to refine the local technology plan and/or infusion of technology.	1	2	3	4	5

3b. PROPOSED ACTIVITIES—20 POINTS (4 items x 5 points each = 20 possible points)

		DISAGREE		AGREE		STRONGLY AGREE
a.	The activities will accomplish the proposal objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
b.	The activities are within the scope of the proposal objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Staff development activities are included to support all objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
d.	The desired impacts are achievable through the proposed activities.	1	2	3	4	5

4a. & b. BUDGET JUSTIFICATIONS—15 POINTS (3 items x 5 points each = 15 points possible)

		DISAGREE		AGREE		STRONGLY AGREE
a.	Items budgeted for are linked to the activities/objectives in this proposal.	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Funding is included for each activity/objective in this proposal.	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Items within each budget category are well supported by a narrative.	1	2	3	4	5

COMMENTS:

2001-2002 TECHNOLOGY LITERACY CHALLENGE FUND APPLICATION
Narrative Responses

Narrative responses to items 1-4b are not to exceed seven pages total, 12 point or larger type, single spaced. Note: The narrative portion of the grant may be printed on paper other than this form as long as all information is included. The same page style and length requirements apply.

1. **Project Abstract: (A brief description of the overall proposal)**

ABSTRACT EXAMPLE:

This proposal from the XYZ school district seeks to impact student learning relevant to state technology content and performance standards 1 (basic operations), 2 (productivity tools), and 3 (communication), provide a districtwide computer network, and train teachers to effectively and efficiently use the computers/network to integrate productivity tools into the teaching and learning environment. Teachers and students will become proficient users of multimedia, spreadsheets and word processing software across the curriculum while targeting the state technology content and performance standards 1, 2, and 3. Data from the Teachers Technology Skills Inventory indicates that 77 percent of the district teaching staff rated themselves as "novice" in the area of basic skills, thus, professional development will be targeted . . . .

2. **School Improvement Linkages: Describe how the proposal objectives connect to and support current school improvement efforts at the local level.   10 points possible**

Objective Number	School Improvement Connection/Support (list appropriate technology plan pages)
Number 1	• The XYZ school district's school improvement plan/strategic education plan identified several district goals. Goal number two of the plan targets the integration of technology into district teaching/learning and curriculum. It specifically targets networking and the implementation of the state content and performance standards for all content areas with a focus on the technology standards. • See Technology Plan pages 24-27 labeled "K"—School Improvement.

Assessment Rubric

	Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree
The objectives and activities included in the grant proposal show a direct link to, and support for, school improvement efforts at the local level (i.e., local goals, local initiatives, etc., or state/national programs such as Schoolwide, Performance-Based Accreditation, Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges performance-based school accreditation option).	1	2	3	4	5
The objectives and activities included in the grant will assist in accomplishing the local goals.	1	2	3	4	5

2001-2002 TECHNOLOGY LITERACY CHALLENGE FUND APPLICATION

Objective #1
90 percent of the learners in the XYZ school district will become proficient in the use of productivity tools via a technology supported literacy lab while developing reading strategies as measured by Running Records and writing skills as measured by Holistic Performance Assessment Scales.
Technology Plan Linkages: See page(s) _14-15 & 33_ of the attached technology plan (label them "Objectives").

OBJECTIVE EVALUATION PLAN

Baseline Student Data (Current Data Aligned to this Objective)	Desired Indicators of Student Impact (Aligned to Baseline Data)	Actual Indicators of Student Impact (To be completed at Year End)
Fall 2000—45 percent of students are at the proficient level in the use of productivity tools as measured by the GTCC student scale. Fall 2000—60 percent of K-3 learners are reading two or more levels below grade level as measured by Reading Recovery Levels. Fall 2000—60 percent of K-3 learners are writing at fluency level 4 or below as measured by the Holistic Developmental Writing Scales.	Year 1 Spring 2000—75 percent of students iwll be providient in the use of productivity tools as measured by the GTCC student scale. Spring 2000—80 percent of K-3 readers will be reading at grade level in writing as measured by the Holistic Performance Assessment Scales. Year 2 Spring 2001—90 percent of students will be proficient in the use of productivity tools as measured by the GTCC student scale. Spring 2001—90 percent of K-3 readers will be reading at grade level as measured by Reading Recovery Levels. Spring 2001—90 percent of learners will grow by two fluency levels in writing as measured by the Holistic Developmental Writing Scales.	End-of-the-Grant-Year Data, aligned to baseline data, to be reported on the Year-End Evaluation.

Baseline Teacher Professional Development Data (Aligned to this objecitve)	Desired Indicators of Professional Development Impact (Aligned to baseline professional Development Data)	Actual Indicators
Fall 2000—65% of district teachers are at the proficient level in the use of productivity tools as measured by the GTCC teacher scale. Fall 2000—20% of district teachers have been trained on the use of Holistic Developmental writing scales.	Spring 2001—90% of district teachers will be proficient in the use of productivity tools as measured by the GTCC teacher scale. Spring 2001—100% of disstrict teachers will be trained on the use of Holistic Developmental writing scales. Spring 2002—100% of district teachers will be proficient in the use of productivity tools as measured by the GTCC Teacher Scale.	End-of-the-Grant-Year Data, aligned to baseline data, to be reported on the Year-End Evaluation.

Proposed Activities to Accomplish the Objective 20 points possible for all activities	Actual Activities Used to Accomplish the Objective (Completed at year end)
1.1 Purchase and install computers in labe and in classrooms. 1.2 Network computers. 1.3 Compile data on GTCC Teacher Assessment Scale. 1.4 Analyze data and plan professional development offerings to improve teachers' technology skills. 1.5 Train teachers in Holistic Developmental Writing Scales. 1.6 Train teachers in Running Records.	Actual activities aligned to the successful completion of this objective.

2001-2002 TECHNOLOGY LITERACY CHALLENGE FUND APPLICATION

4a & b. **Budget justification for year one and year two: List each expenditure and briefly explain how it assists in accomplishing the proposal objectives.**

15 points possible

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION EXAMPLE:

Operating: Training

Item	Function	Year 1	Year 2
Sponsored Classes	Three 3-credit courses offered over 2 years on-site for the purpose of teaching staff strategies for using technology to improve teaching and learning—estimated cost of $1,500 per course (Teachers pay their own credit fees) Reference: Objective #4 and seeks to maximize the expenditures for Objectives #1, 2, 3	$ 1,500	$ 3,000

Equipment:

Item	Function	Year 1	Year 2
Hard wiring for network	Wiring costs within and between buildings throughout the district to be paid by this and other sources.	$ 3,700	
Software purchases and upgrades	Various applicaitons as identified by staff and recommended by review team.	$ 5,400	$ 5,400
Reference: Objective #1		$102,350	$67,200

Assessment Rubric

	Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5
Items budgeted for are linked to the activities/objectives in this proposal.	1	2	3	4	5
Funding is included for each activity/objective in this proposal.	1	2	3	4	5
Items within each budget category are well supported by a narrative.	1	2	3	4	5